

### Remarks

After entry of this amendment, claims 12-20 should be pending. Claim 12 has been amended.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiner Nguyen during the telephone interview of February 8, 2005. Claim 12 was discussed during the interview in view of the prior art rejections stated in the pending Office action. Agreement was reached that, with the amendments presented in this response, claims 12-20 are patentable over the prior art of record. The substance of the interview is summarized in the following remarks.

#### ***I. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 12-14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,610,591 (Jiang *et al.*). Applicant traverses this rejection and requests that it be withdrawn.

Claim 12, as amended, further distinguishes Jiang *et al.* at least because Jiang *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest a first part and a second part that span between and tie together a metal surface and a semiconductor unit. Jiang *et al.* also fails to disclose a second part that directly contacts the metal surface and the semiconductor unit.

Claims 13, 14, 18 and 19 depend from claim 12 and are allowable for the reasons stated for claim 12. Each of the rejected dependent claims is further allowable in view of the patentable combination of features recited in such dependent claim.

#### ***II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jiang *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,281,581 (Desai *et al.*). Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jiang *et al.* in view of AAPA Fig. 1A. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jiang *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,506,671 (Grigg). Applicant traverses these rejections and requests that they be withdrawn.


Claims 15-17 and 20 depend from claim 12 and are allowable for the reasons stated for claim 12. Each of the rejected dependent claims is further allowable in view of the patentable combination of features recited in such dependent claim.

**III. Conclusion**

For the above set out reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now in the application are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By   
Stacey C. Slater  
Registration No. 36,011

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446